

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

None of the claims are amended herein.

Claims 1-17, 20, and 21 are allowed.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-17 and 20-25 are currently pending and under consideration in the present application.

II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-17 and 20-25 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER ROWE (USP# 5,479,190) IN VIEW OF SIDDIQUI (USP# 5,912,661)

The present invention as recited in claim 22 relates to a coordinate input device comprising "a polygonal wheel having plural sides, the polygonal wheel being rotatable about a center thereof, as a first axis, each of the plural sides of the polygonal wheel couples to a respective one or ones of the plurality of rotating bodies such that each of the rotating bodies rotates with the corresponding one of the plural sides about the first axis, and is rotatable about the corresponding one of the plural sides of said polygonal wheel, as a second axis, which is different from the first axis such that the polygonal wheel and the plurality of rotating bodies rotate about the first axis."

The circumferential edge of the polygonal wheel having plural sides rotates about the first axis and each of the rotating bodies rotates along with a corresponding one of the plural sides of said polygonal wheel about the first axis, and each of the rotating bodies is rotatable about the corresponding one of the plural sides as a second axis. Accordingly, each of the rotating bodies corresponds to one side of the plural sides of the polygonal wheel such that a user can rotate the polygonal wheel and the plurality of rotating bodies about a first axis, and rotate the rotating bodies about a second axis.

Rowe teaches a multi-axis continuous loop 150 including a band 152.

However, the band 152 does not rotate and moves in a fixed position. Only the grooved segments 154 of Rowe rotate. Rowe teaches that the grooved segments 154 may also be rotated on the band 152 in the direction indicated by Arrow "R". That is, the grooved segments 154 are slidably mounted on band 152 and may be freely moved along the entire course of the band 152 in the direction indicated by Arrow "M" (see column 8, line 8 - column 9, line 59 and

FIG. 13 through FIG. 17). Rowe does not teach or suggest that grooved segments 154 rotate along with band 152 or that the band 152 even rotates. In the present invention, the claimed rotating bodies rotate along with the polygonal wheel about the first axis. Rowe does not teach the features recited in claim 22.

In item 3 on page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts, "Rowe teaches a wheel 160 which is rotatable along a first axis comprising a plurality of rotating bodies 154 that are disposed along the wheel 160 and rotating with a circumferential edge of said wheel about a first axis and the plurality of rotating bodies rotatable about a second axis."

However, Rowe merely teaches that the pickup roller 160 is intermeshed with segments 154, which are adjacent to it, and receives the rotational movement of the adjacent segments 154 (see column 9, lines 3-6). Contrary to the Examiner's assertions, there is nothing in the Rowe reference that teaches that the pickup roller 160 comprises the segments 154 and that the segments 154 are disposed along the roller 160. The Examiner relies on broad conclusory knowledge and subjective belief in suggesting that Rowe teaches that the pickup roller 160 comprises the segments 154 and that the segments 154 are disposed along the roller 160.

Further, the Examiner alleges that Rowe teaches two wheels, that is, the loop 150 and roller 160. The present invention, however, teaches a single polygonal wheel. Rowe does not teach or suggest the features recited in claim 22 of the present invention.

The Examiner's attention is directed again to MPEP § 2143.01 which states, "[i]n determining the propriety of the Patent Office case for obviousness..., it is necessary to ascertain whether or not the reference teachings would appear to be sufficient for one of ordinary skill in the relevant art having the reference before him to make the proposed substitution, combination, or other modification." *In re Linter*, 458 F.2d 1013, 1016, 173 USPQ 560, 562 (CCPA 1972). Obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either explicitly or implicitly in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. MPEP § 2143.01.

Siddiqui teaches "a computer input device with a...wheel button type z-encoder mechanism. The wheel button is supported on an axle or spindle within the housing of the input device. The axle is supported in the housing by spaced-apart axle supports." (See Siddiqui at column 2, lines 3-8.) Siddiqui, however, does not teach "a polygonal wheel having plural sides, the polygonal wheel being rotatable about a center thereof, as a first axis, each of the plural sides of the polygonal wheel couples to a respective one or ones of the plurality of rotating

bodies such that each of the rotating bodies rotates with the corresponding one of the plural sides about the first axis, and is rotatable about the corresponding one of the plural sides of said polygonal wheel, as a second axis, which is different from the first axis such that the polygonal wheel and the plurality of rotating bodies rotate about the first axis."

Accordingly, Rowe and Siddiqui, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the features as recited in claim 22 of the present invention.

Claim 23 depends from claim 22 and patentably distinguishes over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons as claim 22.

Claim 24 relates to a coordinate input device comprising "a polygonal wheel having plural sides to rotate in a first direction, each of the rotating bodies being rotationally attached to a corresponding one of the plural sides to rotate in a second direction perpendicular to the first direction for multi-axial coordinate input."

Claim 25 relates to a coordinate input device comprising "a polygonal wheel having rotating bodies thereon rotating in a direction perpendicular to a wheel rotation direction for multi-axial coordinate input." Therefore, claims 24 and 25 also distinguish over the cited prior art.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

III. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that each of the claims patentably distinguishes over the prior art, and therefore defines allowable subject matter. A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the rejection along with an indication of allowability of all pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Response, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 12-5-05

By: Derrick L. Fields
Derrick L. Fields
Registration No. 50,133

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone (202) 434-1500
Facsimile (202) 434-1501